



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/001,506	10/23/2001	Manoel Tenorio	020431.0934	3207
53184	7590	04/12/2006		
i2 TECHNOLOGIES US, INC. ONE i2 PLACE, 11701 LUNA ROAD DALLAS, TX 75234			EXAMINER LU, KUEN S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2167	

DATE MAILED: 04/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/001,506	TENORIO, MANOEL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kuen S. Lu	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-11, 13-19 and 21-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-11, 13-19 and 21-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Action is responsive to Applicant's Amendment filed January 23, 2006.
2. Claims 2-11, 13-19 and 21-42 are pending in the application and are rejected.
3. As to Applicant's Remarks, filed January 23, 2006, please see discussion in the section ***Response to Arguments***, following the Office Action for Final Rejection (hereafter "the Action") as shown next. Please note in the Action, Examiner maintains the same grounds for claims rejection as set forth in the Office Action for non-Final Rejection of October 20, 2005.

Drawings

4. Drawings filed October 23, 2001 are accepted.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 36-37 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 36 and 37 duplicate 21 and 22, respectively, all depending on claim 42. See MPEP § 2173.05(d). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2-4, 6, 8-11, 13-15, 17, 19, 21-23, 25, 27-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hess et al. (U.S. Patent 6,732,161, hereafter "Hess"), in view of Keller et al. (U.S. Publication 2003/0050958, hereafter "Keller").

As per claims 30, 35, 42 and 28, Hess teaches the following:

"An electronic commerce system for third party document reuse of transaction documents" (See Figs. 6B, 8 and col. 2, lines 5-15 wherein Hess' eBay® on-line system for person to person trading where user's item images are harvested, stored and made available for users for a defined duration is equivalent to the Applicant's An electronic commerce system for third party document reuse of transaction documents);

"one or more document repositories storing a plurality of transaction documents" (See Fig. 8 and col. 8, line 62 – col. 8, line 18 wherein Hess' user items for sale are retrieved from repository and populated into web pages for serving as a trading document is equivalent to the Applicant's one or more document repositories storing a plurality of transaction documents); and

at least portions of each transaction document capable of being used to facilitate a transaction with one or more of the parties to the transaction document" (See Fig. 9A and col. 9, lines 49-65 wherein Hess' a subset of the items listed are available for sale is equivalent to the Applicant's each of the transaction documents is at least portions of each transaction document capable of being used to facilitate a transaction with one or more of the parties to the transaction document).

Hess does not explicitly teach the transaction documents "each associated with a past transaction of a party to the transaction document", although Hess teaches completed transaction at Fig. 9A and col. 9, line 49 – col. 10, line 6 where "Completed" category of on-line trade for current auction of folk art is available.

However, Keller teaches the transaction documents "each associated with a past transaction of a party to the transaction document" (See Fig. 6 and Page 4, [0042] wherein Keller's transaction log records each transaction conducted, including ordered and acknowledged items is equivalent to the Applicant's the transaction documents each associated with a past transaction of a party to the transaction document).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Keller's teaching with Hess reference because both references are devoted to e-commerce and transaction document processing and, the combined teaching of the two references would have provided a mechanism for users of Hess' system to enhance on-line trading by quicker previewing items via an on-line facility which provides user of a supplier information about the status of the transactions involving the products of the supplier.

The combined teaching of the Keller and Hess references further teaches the following:

"a global content directory including a plurality of classes organized in a hierarchy, each class categorizing the transaction documents and associated with one or more attributes of the transaction documents categorized in the class at least one of the classes having one or more associated pointers that identify one or more document

repositories" (See Hess: Figs. 9A-9B and col. 9, line 49 – col. 10, line 6 wherein Hess' transaction documents are view through the hierarchy of current mode, top: antiques: folk art, current auctions, new today and specific item is equivalent to the Applicant's a global content directory including a plurality of classes organized in a hierarchy, each class categorizing the transaction documents and associated with one or more attributes of the transaction documents categorized in the class at least one of the classes, and Keller: Figs. 5-6 and Page 4, [0046]-[0047] wherein Keller's order information in the transaction log is associated with a specific repository is equivalent to the Applicant's the transaction is associated with pointers that identify one or more document repositories);

"an intelligence module operable to, in response to selection of a transaction document by a party who was not a party to the past transaction associated with the transaction document, create a generic document capable of being used to facilitate a future transaction with at least one of the parties from the selected transaction document stored in the one or more document repositories encrypt at least a portion of the selected information in the selected transaction document thereby making it inaccessible in the generic document" (See Hess: Figs. 9A-9B and col. 9, line 49 – col. 10, line 6 wherein Hess' the items described in the transaction document is presented to perspective buyer to complete the transaction moving item from other status to completed and the buyer may not be the owner of the items being sold or completed is equivalent to the Applicant's an intelligence module operable to, in response to selection of a transaction document by a party who was not a party to the past

transaction associated with the transaction document, create a generic document capable of being used to facilitate a future transaction with at least one of the parties from the selected transaction document stored in the one or more document repositories, and Keller: Page 2, [0015] wherein Keller's the transaction server partitions and utilizes security techniques to protect data from unauthorized access is equivalent to Applicant's the intelligence module is operable to make the selected information in the transaction document inaccessible in the generic document by encrypting at least a portion of the selected information); and

"a search interface operable to communicate a search query for transaction documents to one or more document repositories identified by one or more pointers associated with one or more selected classes" (See Keller: Figs. 5-6 and Page 4, [0046]-[0047] interfaces are available to interpret user's search through SQL query to retrieve data of categories such as ordered or acknowledged from specific database is equivalent to the Applicant's a search interface operable to communicate a search query for transaction documents to one or more document repositories identified by one or more pointers associated with one or more selected classes).

As per claims 2, 13, 21 and 36, Hess further teaches "the transaction documents comprise third party documents" (See Fig. 8 and col. 8, line 62 – col. 8, line 18 wherein Hess' user's image files for sale items are retrieved from repository and populated into web pages for serving as a trading document is equivalent to the Applicant's the transaction documents comprise third party documents).

As per claims 3, 15 and 23, Keller further teaches “wherein the classes comprise a plurality of document classes” (See Figs. 5-6 and Page 4, [0046]-[0047] transaction document categories includes ordered or acknowledged is equivalent to the Applicant’s wherein the classes comprise a plurality of document classes).

As per claims 4, 14, 22 and 37, Keller further teaches “wherein the classes comprise a plurality of product classes” (See Figs. 5-6 and Page 4, [0046]-[0047] transaction document categories includes ordered or acknowledged is equivalent to the Applicant’s wherein the classes comprise a plurality of product classes).

As per claims 6, 31 and 38, Hess further teaches “wherein the search interface is further operable to allow a user to navigate through the classes to search for a particular transaction document” (See Fig. 9A-9B and col. 9, line 49 – col. 10, line 6 wherein Hess’ user navigates the transaction document by clicking through mode, top category, current actions and merchandize is equivalent to the Applicant’s wherein the search interface is further operable to allow a user to navigate through the classes to search for a particular transaction document).

As per claims 10, 32 and 39, Keller further teaches “wherein the documents comprise one or more standard documents stored in a shared document repository” (See Figs. 12-13 and 15-16 wherein Keller’s user authorization forms and generic merchandize

description forms are standard documents is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein the documents comprise one or more standard documents stored in a shared document repository).

As per claims 11, 33 and 40, Keller further teaches "wherein the documents comprise one or more unique documents stored in one or more seller databases" (See Fig. 6 and Page 4, [0047] where transaction documents represented by the identifications ORD322 and ACK456 are specific to an ordered and acknowledged transaction, respectively is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein the documents comprise one or more unique documents stored in one or more seller databases").

As per claims 29, 34 and 41, Keller further teaches "wherein the intelligence module is operable to make the selected information in the selected transaction document inaccessible in the generic document by deleting at least a portion of the selected information" (See Page 2, [0015] wherein Keller's the transaction server partitions and utilizes security techniques to protect data from unauthorized access is equivalent to Applicant's wherein the intelligence module is operable to make the selected information in the selected transaction document inaccessible in the generic document by deleting at least a portion of the selected information).

As per claim 8, Keller further teaches "wherein the search interface is further operable to allow a user to view the generic document" (See Figs. 12-13 and 15-16

wherein Keller's user authorization forms and generic merchandise description forms are standard documents is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein the search interface is further operable to allow a user to view the generic document).

As per claims 17 and 25, Keller further teaches "comprising denying access to the transaction documents when a user does not possess a required permission level" (See Figs. 12-13 and 15-16 wherein Keller's user authorization forms are utilized to authorize user to login the system is equivalent to the Applicant's comprising denying access to the transaction documents when a user does not possess a required permission level).

As per claim 9, Keller further teaches "comprising a security module associated with the global content directory, the security module operable to encrypt the transaction documents to control user access to the documents" (See Page 2, [0015] wherein Keller's manufacturer downloads transaction documents, partitions the file and protects the file by security techniques so that the protected sections will not be disclosed to other unauthorized manufacturers is equivalent to Applicant's comprising a security module associated with the global content directory, the security module operable to encrypt the transaction documents to control user access to the documents).

As per claims 19 and 27, Hess further teaches the following:
"selecting a transaction document from the transaction documents located using the search interface" (See Fig. 5 and col. 6, lines 31-42 wherein Hess' harvesting process

periodically reloads images and updates thumbnails is equivalent to the Applicant's selecting a transaction document from the transaction documents located using the search interface);

"viewing the generic document created from the transaction document" (See Fig. 9A-9B and col. 9, line 49 – col. 10, line 6 wherein Hess' user navigates the transaction document by clicking through mode, top category, current actions and merchandize is equivalent to the Applicant's viewing the generic document created from the transaction document); and

"completing the generic document with a plurality of user specific information" (See Fig. 5 and col. 6, lines 31-42 wherein Hess' harvesting process periodically reloads images and updates thumbnails is equivalent to the Applicant's completing the generic document with a plurality of user specific information).

8. Claims 5, 7, 16, 18, 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hess et al. (U.S. Patent 6,732,161, hereafter "Hess") in view of Keller et al. (U.S. Publication 2003/0050958, hereafter "Keller"), as applied to claims 30, 35 and 42 above, and further in view of Smithies et al. (U.S. Patent 6,091,835, hereafter "Smithies").

As per claims 5, 16 and 24, the combined teaching of Keller and Hess references further teaches the following:

"segments the selected transaction document into one or more sections" (See Hess: Figs. 6A-6B, 9A-9B and col. 6, line 55 – col. 7, line 40 wherein Hess' item registration form is a transaction document where registration form includes segments for user authorization, item description, trading method and user's source file for merchandize is equivalent to the Applicant's segments the selected transaction document into one or more sections); and

"determines which sections of the selected transaction document are generic and which sections are specific to the past transaction" (See Hess: Figs. 6A-6B, 9A-9B and col. 6, line 55 – col. 7, line 40 wherein Hess' item registration form is a transaction document where trading method is generic and a completed item is specific to past transactions).

The combined teaching of Keller and Hess references does not explicitly teach "removes from the selected transaction document information in the sections specific to the past transaction to create the generic document capable of being used to facilitate the future transaction".

However, Smithies teaches pressing a button to remove a Selected List from a presentation box for updating the authentication method selection document (See Figs. 4c and 4g, col. 31, lines 17-38).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Smithies' teaching with Keller and Hess references because the references are devoted to e-commerce and transaction document processing where Hess provides a generic system while Smithies teaches transcribing electronic affirmations, and the combined reference would have further

enhanced Hess system's functionality by the implementation of flexibly updating e-commerce trading transaction document.

The combined teaching of Smithies, Keller and Hess references further teaches "carries forward the generic sections from the selected transaction document into the generic document to protect one or more confidential details in the selected transaction document" (See Keller: Page 2, [0015] wherein Keller's manufacturer downloads transaction documents, partitions the file and protects the file by security techniques so that the protected sections will not be disclosed to other unauthorized manufacturers is equivalent to Applicant's carries forward the generic sections from the selected transaction document into the generic document to protect one or more confidential details in the selected transaction document).

As per claims 7, 18 and 26, the combined teaching of Smithies, Keller and Hess references further teaches "wherein the intelligence module is further operable to dynamically adjust the information in the sections in the generic document to include current information" (See Hess: Fig. 5 and col. 6, lines 31-42 wherein Hess' harvesting process periodically reloads images and updates thumbnails is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein the intelligence module is further operable to dynamically adjust the information in the sections in the generic document to include current information).

9. The prior art made of record

A. U.S. Publication 2003/0050958

D. U.S. Patent 6,091,835

E. U.S. Patent 6,732,161

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

B. U.S. Patent 6,442,574

C. U.S. Publication 2001/0049675

F. U.S. Patent 6,523,037

G. U.S. Publication 2005/0033648

H. U.S. Publication 2002/0188551

I. U.S. Publication 2004/0138966

U. Oracle® e-Commerce Gateway, User's Guide, Release 11i.2, August 2000.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments, filed January 23, 2006, have been fully considered. For the Examiner's response, please see discussion below.

a). At Pages 14-15, concerning claims 30, 28, 35 and 42, the Applicant argued the Hess reference fails to provide teaching of "third party document reuse of transaction documents".

As to the above argument a), Examiner respectfully submits that third party eBay® provides transaction document reuse of transaction documents to buyers and sellers, as examples, please refer to Fig. 6B where the document is provided for

transaction, including registering different quantities for the same item after duration expires, a reuse of the transaction document, further, please note at col. 2, lines 14-16 where thumbnail images are aggregated into web page for presenting to the buyer where web page is also a generic and reuse document for aggregating customized information, the thumbnail images.

b). At Pages15-16, concerning claims 30, 28, 35 and 42, the Applicant further argued the Hess reference fails to provide teaching of "document repositories storing a plurality of transaction documents each associated with a past transaction of a party to the transaction document".

As to the above argument **b)**, Examiner respectfully submits that Hess does teach seller re-registering the same item for different quantities after duration expires, as described in item **a)**, which does suggest transaction documents each associated with a past transaction of a party to the transaction document, however, Examiner submits the suggestion is not explicitly expressed and Examiner introduced Keller reference for compensating the deficiencies, as further described below in responding to Applicant's further continuous argument.

c). At Pages16-17, concerning claims 30, 28, 35 and 42, the Applicant continued to argue the Keeler reference fails to provide teaching of transaction documents "each associated with a past transaction of a party to the transaction document".

As to the above argument **c)**, Examiner respectfully submits that Keller does teach keeping transaction logs each associated with a past transaction (See Fig. 6 and Page 4, [0041]). Please note the teaching of Keller's keeping past transaction document for future utilization in combination with Hess' teaching of re-registering same item based on document used for past transaction to present merchandise information does fully provide the teaching of "document repositories storing a plurality of transaction documents each associated with a past transaction of a party to the transaction document".

d). At Pages 17-19, concerning claims 30, 28, 35 and 42, the Applicant alleged that the Hess or Keeler reference has nothing to do with the alleged invented subject matter of "a global directory including a plurality of classes" at which class having pointer to identify document repositories, encrypting portion of selected information in selected transaction document for making it inaccessible in the generic document. Applicant also alleged that the references fail to teach "a search interface" operable to communicate with a search query...

As to the above argument **d)** about a lengthy allegation concerning the references failing to teach or suggest, Examiner respectfully submits that the references do teach each element as of the specific claimed subject matter. Hess teaches hierarchical structure of document repositories (Figs. 9A-9B and col. 9, line 49 to col. 10, line 6) wherein pointers direct to document categories, the classes. Keller further teaches pointers pointing to transaction documents. At Page 2, [0015], Keller further teaches

security techniques to protect data of document from unauthorized access. Examiner interprets security techniques include data encryption and please further note each limitation has been given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification and in light of the supporting disclosure in the Action (See MPEP , 2106 [R-2], 2111 [R-1]) and further note In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. > E-Pass Techs, Inc. v. 3Com Corp., 343 F.3d 1364, 1369, 67 USPQ2d 1947, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (claims must be interpreted "in view of the specification" without importing limitations from the specification into the claims unnecessarily).

As to the allegation of references failing to teach a search interface operable to communicate with a search query, please refer to Keller: Figs. 5-6 and Page 4, [0046]-[0047] where interface is provided to interpret user's search via structured query language interpreter. Also please note this is just one of the interfaces for interpreting user's search. Basically, every form in Figs. 6s and 9s of Hess reference is a user's interface to query.

e). At Page 18, concerning claims 30, 28, 35 and 42, the Applicant alleged that the Hess or Keeler reference fails to teach an "intelligence module" operable to create a generic document.

As to the above allegation e), Examiner respectfully submits that Hess reference does provide the teaching by providing form for user to register or re-register

merchandise and providing web page for allowing user to aggregate thumbnail images (Figs. 9A-9B, col. 9, line 49 to col. 10, line 6 and col. 2, lines 14-16).

f). At Pages19-20, concerning claims 30, 28, 35 and 42, the Applicant alleged Examiner failed to establish a *prima facie* of obviousness for motivation in combining Hess and Keller references.

As to the above allegation f), Examiner respectfully submits that, in response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, both the two references are directed to on-line trading, an e-commerce application, where transaction volume is huge and transaction cost is high. It is critical to enhance the on-line trading by providing a mechanism allowing users to quickly scan and review merchandise, expressed in the form documents. The performance of the on-line trading system would have been enhanced via combining the teaching from the two references by including both current and past transaction information.

g). At Pages 20-22, concerning claims 5, 16 and 24, the Applicant argued that the Hess, Keller reference fails to teach “removes from the selected transaction document information in the sections specific to the past transaction to create the generic document capable of being used to facilitate the future transaction”.

As to the above allegation **g)**, Examiner respectfully submits that the Hess reference teaches generic documents in the form of registration form or web page for user facilitate future transaction where registration form allows user to remove section of document (See Figs. 6A-6B). However, Hess or Keller reference does not explicitly teach that document with section removed be saved for future transaction and Smithies reference was introduced to provide the deficient teaching by explicitly removing information for keeping the updated version of document (See Figs. 4c and 4g).

h). At Page 22, concerning claims 7, 18 and 26, the Applicant argued that the Hess, Keller or Smithies reference fails to teach “wherein the intelligence module is further operable to dynamically adjust the information in the sections in the generic document to include current information”.

As to the above allegation **h)**, Examiner respectfully submits that the combined teaching of the references provides the teaching where Hess harvesting process periodically reloads images and updates thumbnails to the generic web-page.

i). At Pages 23-24, concerning claims 7, 18 and 26, the Applicant urged Examiner to provide the section(s) of Hess, Keller or Smithies which provides suggestion or motivation for combining the teaching of the references.

As to the above allegation i), Examiner respectfully submits that the motivations or suggestions come from many sections from the references, for examples, Smithies: at col. 6, lines 56-61 and col. 7, lines 2-6 Smithies suggests e-commerce system must work reliably by implementing a broad ranges of electronic signature types where substantial evidence about knowledge of a document is needed, constructed and maintained where "a document" suggests each time a document is involved. Further at col. 1, lines 16-35, Smithies specifically relates the reference to electronic transaction processing and validation and verification of accountings which are such a crucial parts of e-commerce application; Hess and Keller: at Abstract of each reference suggests the application is related to on-line transactions under e-commerce environment.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2167

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact information

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuen S Lu whose telephone number is (571) 272-4114. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00 am-5:00 pm). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on 571-272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for Page 13 published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 886-217-9197 (toll-free)..

Kuen S. Lu

Patent Examiner

April 9, 2006

